DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 066 JC 690 011

Proceedings of a Conference on Research-Based Planning and Development (Durham, North Carolina, June 27-30, 1968).

Regional Education Lab. for the Carolinas and Virginia, Rougemont, N.C.
Pub Date [68]
Note-78p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.00
Descriptors-*Conference Reports, *Educational Planning, Governance, *Higher Education, *Institutional Research, *Junior Colleges
Identifiers-Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas

Conferees heard five papers designed to emphasize some contemporary problems of higher education. The keynote address stresses the role of the institutional researcher, who must not only be capable in his discipline of research, but also be concerned that his work is relevant to institutional needs and problems. He must place the results in professional service to the continuing development of the institution. The second address concerns the probable trends in higher education in the South in the next twenty years. The remaining three papers deal with issues arising out of current student and faculty demands for increased participation in the governance of their institutions. In addition to the papers above, this document reviews the two workshop/conferences leading up to the present conference, and summarizes three research reports from participating institutions. (MC)

PROCEEDINGS

CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH-BASED PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

PROCEEDINGS

CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH-BASED PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

JUNE 27-30, 1968

VOYAGER INN
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

Dr. J. A. Davis in the Introduction which follows has captured both the spirit and quality, not only of this third conference on "educational development" in higher educational institutions, but even more important the mission and strategies of the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia in its efforts to promote constructive innovation and change in individual colleges and universities and in state departments (or councils) of higher education, based on the findings of research and on the implementation of new technologies.

RELCV believes that innovation and change in individual colleges and universities must be aimed ultimately toward the improvement of the educational experiences of their students; but, it also believes the college's influence on the student can be enhanced greatly by the improvement of institutional processes from which new curricula and new instructional technologies emerge. RELCV also believes that the best educational decisions emerge from facts, on the one hand, and from a genuine partnership of students, faculty, administrators and trustees on the other. Hence, the rationale for RELCV's initial interest in institutional research, in institutional planning and decision making, and in applying the new technologies (many computer-assisted) to the processes of institutional analysis and decision making *before* directing major attention to the more important matters of curriculum and instruction. Only when sufficient information is known about the characteristics of the students attending a particular institution, the characteristics of the faculty and the administration, the purposes of the institution, and the climate for learning that has already been established, is it fruitful to embark upon such objectives as curriculum reforms, instructional improvements, or major changes in institutional policy.

May I express again my deepest appreciation to Dr. Davis, to his colleagues at the Educational Testing Service and to the officers of the Educational Testing Service at Princeton

for their invaluable contribution to the early development of the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia. Persons who have not been intimately involved in the birth and unstable infancy of such an agency—charged with a new role in the educational system of both the region and the nation—will never know of the difficulties, obstacles and uncertainties that had to be dealt with. For his constant help on both trivial and substantive matters, we express our deep appreciation to Dr. Davis.

Everett H. Hopkins
President, RELCV

INTRODUCTION

The essays included in this monograph are drawn from presentations at the third of a continuing series of workshop/conferences sponsored by the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia and held in Durham, North Carolina, June 27-30, 1968. This series is directed specifically toward the development of new processes for incorporating higher education research into long-range planning and innovation in institutions of higher education, and of a new role for a senior staff member of the college or university who must contrive and execute useful but rigorous research, and who must communicate and diffuse the findings in such ways that effective long-range planning may be initiated or facilitated.

The germ of the idea for the larger activity of which these workshops are a part grew out of discussions in 1966 led by Everett Hopkins, then chairman of the higher education task force for RELCV, and which included John Lavach and Robert Simpson, then of the office of the vice president for regional programs at Duke University; a nine-man advisory committee from North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia; Drs. John Centra, J. A. Davis, Rodney Hartnett, Robert Linn and Richard Peterson of the higher education research group at Educational Testing Service; and, Dr. Robert Stoltz, director of the southeastern regional office of the College Entrance Examination Board.

This group took early note of the routiness with which many of the conventional institutional research officers conduct studies, and the frequent absence of relevance for specific institutional problems in the work of discipline-oriented social scientists who concern themselves with one or another aspect of higher education.

Toward the establishment of new models and roles for what has since been named the "Educational Development Officer," the following assumptions were formulated:

> (1) The individual charged with conducting institutional studies should be a senior

academic officer, responsible directly to the president of his institution;

(2) He must be capable of taking a serious, mature and perceptive view of the basic problems of higher education;

(3) He must be able to stand high in the regard and respect of the best, concerned faculty members of his institution;

(4) He must have adequate released time for his research mission, both to formulate and conduct relevant research and to place the findings in channels for action;

(5) He must possess *or acquire* a reasonable skill in the several methods of social science research (e.g., the methods of historical analysis, of empirical investigation, of quantitative or statistical design, etc.), that his work may be sharp and its limitations or qualifications known to him;

(6) He must accept, as the ultimate test of the educational process, the evidence of impact of the institution on the student and staff; this requires an interactional focus on input, process, context, output and consequence factors;

(7) He must be helped in determining modern resources—of previous studies, instrumentation, data processing—that may be useful in defining relevant problems for his attention and the alternate strategies and attacks on these problems that he can employ.

In this view, the further assumptions are implicit that few prototypes for this role now exist, and that continuous, informed and directed local study is needed for institutional planning and innovation. As the prime mission of RELCV has

been established as the development of models for contriving the innovation and change processes that assure institutional vitality, an activity for establishing the role and aiding in the development of persons to fill it promised to afford an avenue for the determination of useful research and for formal study of the dynamics of institutional development. Therefore, as an integral component of its larger program, RELCV did initiate, in the summer of 1967, a three-year activity for the training of the proposed new breed of educational development officers, and for exploring with a discrete group of participants the effective translation of the findings of higher education research into action.

College and university presidents in the three-state area were invited to nominate qualified individuals for participating, along with themselves, in the formal series of activities designed to establish the mission of informed and continuous improvement of their respective institutions. Criteria used in selecting institutions from among those making formal application for membership in the consortium focused on: (1) availability of an individual high in the regard of his president and faculty members, with strength in his discipline, and with sufficient released time for in-service training and for the conduct of institutional studies; (2) commitment of the president to the program; and (3) (to a lesser extent) a sufficient spread of institutional types and categories of institutional problems to assure reasonable ingredients for RELCV's basic mission of developing models for the institutional innovation and change process.

The first workshop, held at Montreat-Anderson College in the summer of 1967, followed a briefing by and to the presidents of 18 colleges represented. Led by Drs. Rodney Hartnett and John Centra (acting as RELCV staff), and supported by special access to consultants such as Dr. Joseph Saupe of Michigan State and vice president Stanley Ikenberry of the University of West Virginia, the instructional content of the sessions fell into two major categories: the substance of the concerns of higher education in the United States and the essential principles and techniques of social science

research. An ambitious schedule of readings, a number of institutional case studies, some role-playing exercises and spirited give-and-take marked the first two weeks of this workshop. In the third week, each institutional representative was provided with a plan for a carefully formulated core program of research focusing on exploring, over time, the growth and development of one class of students in the context of augmented information about the learning environment. In addition to establishing the ground work to permit this core study to be conducted in common by the participants, further individual attention by workshop staff was directed toward helping the institutional representative contrive other particular studies (either unique inquiries or specific embellishments on the core study) that represented for him crucial concerns at his own institution.

Accordingly, the representatives returned to their campuses and initiated, in the fall of 1967, the basic data collection required by this plan. In addition to information about students already routinely collected, most of the institutions added the information on student backgrounds, attitudes and aspirations provided by the *College Student Questionnaires, Part I.* Several institutions also administered, toward a before-and-after design, the brief subject matter achievement tests of the *Survey of College Ability.*

The second workshop, held at mid-year of the 1967-68 academic year at the Quail Roost Conference Center in Rougemont, N. C., had several important goals. One was to begin a formal joint examination of the specific findings in the individual institutional studies started by the participants, toward helping each participant to augment his experience with that of the others, to increase his inventory of researchable problems and to deepen his perspectives of the implications of his own data. Six of the representatives aided earlier by RELCV consultants who had visited their campuses presented descriptions of specific findings, or of their larger developing programs.

A second major goal of the mid-year workshop was the initiation of explorations of ways in which findings could be

diffused into the mainstream of institutional planning, and in which the ongoing research could, without prostituting honorable methodology, be better directed to real problems. The keynote address by Dr. James Montgomery (a past president of the Association for Institutional Research) was directed toward this matter, and was subsequently invoked by staff and participants into their consideration of what they had found or might find in later work.

Some minor time was also directed to an overview of modern data processing methods and resources either toward helping representatives to utilize resources of their own or near-by institutions, of anticipated computer capabilities of RELCV or of national resources such as those of the College Board Validity Study Service.

Following the mid-year workshop, the institutions continued, with the occasional help of RELCV staff, their basic data collection and analysis program in the continuing core study. For most, this involved the follow-up administration of the second part of the *College Student Questionnaires* (to determine changes in attitudes and values of students over their first college year); the administration of the *College and University Environment Scales* (to examine students' perceptions of their learning environment); and, the collection of other perceptions of the college from administrators and faculty through the experimental *Institutional Functioning Inventory*.

The third workshop, from which the papers for this monograph were selected, was drawn on the same premises and goals as those formulated earlier. Not only did most of the original workshop participants return, but many brought with them the natural cohorts from their faculty or administration who had emerged as they had proceeded with their studies. To maintain the centrality of the college president in the work of the participants from colleges involved in the consortium, and to aid the presidents in understanding and utilizing the potentials of the RELCV strategy, these chief academic officers of the participating colleges also were invited.

The content of the third workshop was designed to permit again the cooperative review of the accumulated findings and to speculate on the implications and strategies to infuse findings into planning. However, to maintain the style and tone of the activity and to prevent the straying of attention to the more petty details of methods and technologies, a renewed emphasis on some contemporary problems of higher education was felt to be crucial.

In the papers following, Dr. Kenneth Wilson, vice president for research of the College Research Center with offices at Vassar College, reflects the chronic and acute pangs of conscience of the educational development officer who is not only capable in his discipline of research, but also is very much concerned that his work be relevant to institutional needs and problems, and that he places the results in professional service to the continuing development of the institution.

Dr. Gordon Blackwell's paper, drawn from an intensive investigation commissioned by the Southern Regional Education Board, reflects the hypothesis of the sociologist-turned-college-president about probable crucial trends in higher education in the South over the next 20 years.

A trilogy of papers by Dr. Julian Foster (a political economist); Dr. William Van Alstyne (a professor of law) and Dr. William Craig (a specialist by training and past experience in student personnel administration, and by more recent experience in higher education generally) is devoted to those issues arising out of current student and faculty clamor for new kinds of participation in academic governance.

One important ingredient of the conference, not included herein because it was planned more as a discussion than as a formal paper, was presented by Dr. Sharvey Umbeck, president of Knox College and the current chairman of the American Council on Education. Dr. Umbeck sketched the corporation model as a vehicle for describing how research may lead from institutional management problems to their solution. Dr. Umbeck also provided a number of specific examples of how the research strategy or the conduct of

specific studies had contributed to the phenomonal development of his institution.

This, then, is a part of the background and the context of the third RELCV workshop for educational development officers. The materials following are reproduced not so much in the impossible hope that the spirit, enthusiasm and many sterling contributions of the total body of participants could be captured, but rather as a record for those present who may have been too occupied with their own thoughts to have preserved, in detail, the excellent and thoughtful statements of the speakers.

One other comment is in order here. This has to do with the rather wonderful discovery that something real and positive beyond the original goals or the subtle half-hidden purposes of RELCV to develop models for planning and innovation had occurred. That is the highest order of professional camaraderie, mutual respect, and sustained interest in the other institutions' problems that has grown out of the experiment. Perhaps this is attributable to the repeated contact among participants, or their common core of research, or the high quality and variety of insights from the multi-discipline representatives, or the fact that they have accepted responsibily their freedom to run with their own problems, or the interest and active support of their presidents. The high quality of the following papers is matched by the high quality of thought with which they were received, and other groups may want to explore the essential lessons of the experiment.

J. A. Davis
Conference Director

THE COMPLEAT RESEARCHER

Keynote Address

Kenneth M. Wilson

The value of research as an instrument for the management and improvement of educational institutions and programs is today almost axiomatic. Relevant signs of the times include the emergence of a professional organization for individuals engaged in newly developing institutional research programs, an increasingly voluminous body of literature on educational institutional research and investment of funds by governmental agencies and foundations in programs of research on educational problems at all levels from nursery to graduate school. As one observer put it recently:

> Colleges across the land are instituting self-studies at an unprecedented rate; officers of institutional research are becoming the newest feature in the organization charts of institutions of higher education; the United States Office of Education Bureau of Research budget is almost $100 million per year. The question for many is not *whether* research will improve education, but when.[1]

Yet, I believe it is fair to say that most colleges and universities have neither developed viable rationales for institutional research programs on their own campuses nor made definite provision for conducting such programs. The concept of institutional research remains relatively unstructured. It currently embraces topics ranging from unit cost analysis and faculty load through problems of space

1 K. Patricia Cross, "When Will Research Improve Education?", *The Research Reporter*, Vol. II, No. 4, 1967 (Center for the Study of Higher Education, Berkeley, California).

utilization and resource allocation, to study of the validity of admissions decisions, assessment of institutional environments and evaluation of educational outcomes.

You are already familiar with Henry Dyer's excellent analysis of divergent points of view about institutional research, an analysis which is worthy of frequent reexamination.[2]

Given the vast, unstructured, researchable domain suggested by the current range of potential research interests, it is understandable that institutional research has tended to resist succinct definition and that the basic dimensions of this field of endeavor are not clearly delineated. It is also understandable that the way in which research is carried out and the results assimilated vary markedly from one campus to another. It should be emphasized, however, that we know very little about the assimilation process except that it is rather complex. Moreover, we should not be astonished or chagrined to find, if we should presume to inquire, that most members of most college communities do not have a clear—much less shared—conception of the nature and potential value of what may be thought of as an institutional educational research and development function. (I would add, parenthetically, that we would probably find this state of affairs to be prevalent without regard to the presence or absence on a campus of an office or official bearing an institutional research-related title.)

Common Threads Emerge

Despite the ambiguity and diversity which characterize the developing institutional research movement, however, certain common threads appear to underlie the emergence of an incipient institutional research function in institutions of higher education which traditionally have valued and promoted research and scholarship on problems defined at disciplinary levels but not on problems defined at a mission or institution-wide level. These threads include vastly increased pressures on institutions to develop and maintain efficient procedures and programs as well as the belief that

---

2 Henry S. Dyer, "Can Institutional Research Lead to a Science of Institution?," *The Educational Record*, Fall 1966, 452-466.

research can contribute to the alleviation of problems—to solution of problems, if you will—and to development of improved procedures in education.

In the nature of things, more attention has been given to analysis of problems of resource allocation (at institutional as well as state and national levels) than to systematic analysis of problems of educational assessment and evaluation. Problems of survival must be dealt with first. As Dyer has pointed out, institutional researchers ignore this fact of life at their peril. However, the importance of reliable knowledge about the educational process is also being acknowledged—knowledge about student attributes, educational treatments, associated outcomes; about the impact of the student on the college and vice versa; about what changes take place and what happens to students during their college careers and who or what is responsible; about the characteristics of our institutions. Concomitantly, there is increasing consideration of the potential value of formal procedures for identifying, measuring and studying the interaction of variables, both personal and situational, which affect the nature and the outcomes of the educational process. This is being encouraged by many external agencies—Educational Testing Service, centers for the study of higher education, admissions testing agencies and regional education agencies, among them RELCV.

Also contributing to increased interest in research approaches to educational problems is the fact that many colleges are being forced for the first time to examine critically their major reasons for being and to redefine (even to clarify) their objectives in the face of changing social conditions and economic pressures. Once the winds of change reach gale force, all institutions recognize the importance of reliable knowledge about themselves, their accomplishments, their potentialities and their limitations.

All too often, however, they are faced at such times with essentially irremediable, unbridgeable "knowledge gaps," attributable in large part to the fact that over the years colleges have not maintained programs of research and

evaluation predicated on the assumption that presuppositions regarding institutional objectives, procedures, arrangements and accomplishments are (or should be thought of and treated as) hypotheses to be systematically tested rather than axioms requiring no verification in experience and no test in terms of observed consequences.

Institutionalizing the Research Function

By and large, colleges have relied on informal, highly personalized, unsystematic methods of observing and evaluating the educational process, and we have a very long way to go before gaining general acceptance in our college communities of the need for formal, organized research programs—for institutionalizing a research function, if you will, to be implemented as regularly and as faithfully as other institutional functions.

Suffice it to say, despite the general compatibility and acceptability of the concept of systematic inquiry in academic settings, commitment to systematic inquiry into the *educational process* is still not widely shared and, as yet, there is no pervasive feeling within most college communities that conventional methods of generating answers to educational questions should be augmented or modified.

In fact, those who have questioned essentially exclusive reliance on informal, conventional, personalized methods of knowing often have had little support from their colleagues and only limited success in their efforts to establish a research base for important educational decisions. The situation in many colleges has been characterized aptly by Elizabeth May:

> In almost every college I know there have been some courageous members who have been saying that the methods we were using were not certain to accomplish our purpose. (However) those few hardy souls who tried to measure have found themselves chewing on very dry toast. I think that I may safely say

> that they have bloodied their heads against just as stony a wall as I have. In trying to see what has happened to us since just before the last war, what do we have to look at? Median verbal aptitude, mathematical aptitude and English composition! I have a mass of interview notes on the problems I have known about for 15 years; but how can I summarize what they mean in terms of how our incoming population has changed, what we have accomplished with our product or what our product has accomplished with itself.[3]

Those of us who propose that colleges and universities should introduce and support educational research programs may well ask why our institutions do not have a research basis for decision making in academic affairs. Why, as some observers have suggested, have institutional research approaches contributed to the orderly and efficient management of nonacademic affairs while failing to make a significant impact on the course of academic life and academic decision making? Why, despite rather consistent promotion and encouragement of educational research by external agencies, does the implementation of educational research tend to remain a peripheral concern on our respective campuses?

Factors Militating Against Research

Examination of such questions, I believe, can be more than an academic exercise. First of all, thorough analysis of these questions should engender a healthy degree of humility; second, but no less important, such an analysis can lead to the identification of some of the conceptual and practical factors which have militated against establishment of educational institutional research and development as a recognized function on our campuses.

I would like to share with you tonight some thoughts about a few of these factors and their implications for us.

3 Elizabeth May, "The College Research Center," in College Entrance Examination Board, *Research in Higher Education* (N. Y.: The Board, 1965), pp. 9-15.

We may begin our examination by recognizing that conventional methods have some merit! One factor which has deterred the adoption of formal, organized methods of inquiry addressed to educational questions is the fact that traditional, informal methods have *not* prevented colleges from carrying out their academic functions, with some degree of success and with minimal challenge to budget or established ways of thinking and doing business.

Questions which pertain to the nature of collegiate institutions, the characteristics of students, the conditions of faculty service, the outcomes of education and the interrelationship of various facts about these circumstances—questions of genuine significance—as Mayhew has noted, are answered conventionally in a variety of ways, including sheer logic from some stated or assumed absolute premise; hunch or insight based on fugitive information or evidence; discussion of committees and informal groups; and inferences by some strategically placed individual based on accumulated data or observation.

All these modes are now in use. They are efficacious to some degree, and they serve in lieu of more systematic research approaches. Mayhew asserts that discussion of educational research should be concerned with the question of whether or not and in what circumstances research can validly provide better answers than those provided by conventional methods.[4] The selection of techniques should, of course, be guided by analysis of the problem. However, I would assert that formal research procedures should be thought of as paralleling and interacting with conventional procedures, not as a substitute for them; but I would also emphasize that the reverse is equally true: *Formal structuring of experience is a necessary precondition to its systematic evaluation. Conventional procedures lack this essential quality.*

Of course, continued reliance on informal, conventional procedures in dealing with educational questions is due only in part to the fact that such procedures are at least minimally adequate. It may be hypothesized that members of a college

4 Lewis Mayhew, "Educational Research, Its Capabilities and Limitations," in CEEB, *Research in Higher Education*, pp. 1-8.

community, because they are members of different disciplines, have difficulty in agreeing upon a formal "truth strategy" which might be applicable to the development of a research function.

Differences in Truth Strategies

The world of academic specialisms is highly differentiated in its culture. There are discipline-related differences in values, beliefs and attitudes in matters of scholarship, knowledge and truth. These differences constitute differences in "truth strategies"—rules and beliefs about knowledge, how it is sought and sifted and what constitutes "evidence."[5] Which strategy or set of strategies can earn the allegiance and support of the college community? That which is characteristic of the sociologist or psychologist? That which is characteristic of the humanist? That which is characteristic of the natural scientist? Lacking consensus about the validity of various ways of "knowing," and the intrinsic or instrumental value of the "evidence" adduced through their application, it is simpler to have *no* organization than to seek to *develop* consensus.

More than two cultures are represented in a college community; the best designed, most disinterested and objective analysis of educational problems from the perspective of the psychologist may fail to impress the humanist. In such circumstances excellent *educational research* by one set of criteria may have little or no real influence beyond that set's own circle of true believers.

In essence, basic problems of communication and research strategy exist—problems which must be recognized and solved if the results of educational research are to be perceived as relevant across the disciplinary board.

Boyer has suggested, correctly I believe, that researchers frequently do not know (or try to understand) the attitudes, opinions or state of knowledge of their colleagues about particular topics being studied. Hence, they cannot make informed judgments regarding effective methods of reporting results of research.[6] A bit of consumer research for

5 This concept of "truth strategies" derives from unpublished work of James D. Thompson and others. For a brief treatment of this concept in the context of interdepartmental relations, see Demerath, Stephens and Taylor, *Power, Presidents and Professors* (N. Y.: Basic Books, 1967), pp. 189-194.

6 E. L. Boyer, "The Impact of Institutional Research on the Academic Program" (Albany, New York: Office of the Vice-Chancellor for University-Wide Activities, State University of New York, 1967), Multilith.

marketing the educational research product may well be in order.

We do not need consumer research, however, to recognize the implications of the maxim that "one man's explanatory hypothesis may be another man's confusion." (One man's "Eureka!" may be another man's "Bah! Humbug!")

A final item in this limited analysis of deterrents to establishment of educational research and development as a basic institutional concern springs from what may be called the "fragmentation of research." The traditional approach to "research and studies" as applied to educational affairs on our campuses has been strictly *ad hoc*—we have used research procedures irregularly and, as suggested earlier, often only as a belated response to unanticipated (theoretically anticipatable) needs for information. There has been little or no interrelation between these *ad hoc* efforts. Particular research projects or studies have not related to any general research and development rationale. As a result the impact of numerous individual projects has been greatly reduced and the image of educational research has suffered accordingly. In essence, *ad hoc* research findings have tended to relate to the body academic through a process characterized by irregular ingestion, faculty assimilation and quite regular elimination.

I am convinced that so long as research remains a "sometime thing" this state of affairs is likely to continue. I am familiar with the dictum that the best way to kill a good idea is to institutionalize it, but I believe that organized, continuous research initiative on our campuses will be necessary if research is to contribute to increased understanding of our institutions and of what goes on inside them.

The participation of so many colleges in this RELCV program suggests acceptance, at least tentatively, of the potential value of organized effort; there has been a definite allocation of responsibility and funds for the exploration of specific problems.

I would strongly urge that, from the outset, our concern for the accomplishment of specific research goals be more

than matched by our active concern for the broader question of how the process of inquiry can be sustained as a way of life on our home grounds—college campuses where educational decisions are made.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH 1968-1988

Gordon W. Blackwell

I am pleased to have this chance to talk with you for a few minutes about higher education in the South in the next 20 years. I believe I was asked to speak to you because I wrote a paper on this subject for the Southern Regional Education Board earlier this month. Back in the winter when SREB Director Winfred Godwin commissioned me to do this paper, I told him it really could not be done, at least not by one individual. I suggested that he appoint a commission, balance it carefully with various points of view and prestigious people and provide a staff. In a year a commission of that sort could come up with a definitive statement on what higher education in the South will be like 20 years from now. He said he could not do that, and I would have to do the best I could. Trying to find a weekend here and there to work on this, I did at least come up with something that I hope will stimulate thought and discussion throughout the region.

In looking at higher education in the South, I found myself examining trends that were documented and could be analyzed and projected over the next 20 years. I looked also for goals that have already been enunciated or are coming to be talked about, because it seems to me that what we will be like in the future will result partially from trends that are already underway; these trends perhaps cannot be changed a great deal even by regional education laboratories. The future will be affected also by goals that have already been and are being set, and here regional education laboratories can probably be of greater significance.

Out of this rather long SREB manuscript, I have decided to talk on four subjects, the first two dealing with regional analysis: (1) the availability of higher education and (2) the

quality of higher education in the South over the next 20 years. Here I shall give attention to how the South ranks with other parts of the country. Then I shall move to two additional areas that are perhaps more significant to you in your own institutions: (3) academic innovation and what we may expect in the future, certainly what we should do to encourage academic innovation; and (4) what we can do to improve college management. The significance of institutional research is quite evident in these two last areas.

Availability of Higher Education

First, then, what about the matter of availability of higher education? The Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South has said, among other things, that every individual should have the opportunity to progress as far as his interest and capabilities will permit. Some, such as Alvin Eurich, predict free education through the junior college level. One has to consider, I suppose, whether this will actually come about in the South in the next 20 years, even though it has almost been reached in California. On this point I am rather doubtful, because I believe that in higher education we shall approach a point of diminishing returns in this respect. It seems to me that in terms of the distribution of innate ability, cost and available financial resources, it is doubtful whether we should attempt to reach such a goal as free education through the junior college level. I think we have to ask ourselves how far the service tax dollar will stretch as we look at public finance and see the many demands upon both state treasuries and the federal government. We will have to determine what areas in education should be emphasized first.

In any event, I am sure that educational opportunity beyond the high school will be extended to an increasing percentage of the people of college age. In this respect the South has lagged behind the rest of the nation, and I believe it will continue to lag. In 1950 the United States had 27 percent of college-age young people enrolled in some type of education beyond the high school, while the South had 19

percent—an 8 percent gap. By 1965 the proportion for the country was 47 percent, while the South had gone up to 35 percent—a 12 percent gap.

And so over that 15-year period we lost ground in the apparently never-ending effort of the South to catch up with the rest of the nation as measured by social, economic and educational indices. By 1980 the SREB predicts that 66 percent of college-age people in the United States will be enrolled in higher education. They forecast for the South 56 percent—a 10 percent gap. My own predictions are that, by 1988, 20 years from now, these percentages will increase to 70 percent for the country and 60 percent for the South. So, you see, I am not optimistic that the South will close this gap.

We know that an increasing proportion of college students are enrolled in public as contrasted with private institutions. In 1950, 62 percent of all students were in public institutions; by 1966, 74 percent. I believe that, by 1988, 85 percent of college students will be enrolled in public institutions in the country as a whole.

The South has had a somewhat lower ratio of its college enrollees in public institutions. In South Carolina, for example, 43 percent are in private institutions, leaving only 57 percent in public institutions. But even in the South the growth of tax-supported institutions properly and necessarily will be quite rapid.

New Role of Community Colleges

An important result of this growth is the new role of community colleges. In Florida we have seen great development in this area, and now in other southern states similar development is underway. By 1988 we can expect each of the southern states to have developed a system of public junior colleges so that at least 90 percent of the South's population will be within an hour's drive of one of these democratizing institutions.

In graduate education the South has lagged. I think back

to 1932 when I began graduate work under Howard W. Odum at Chapel Hill. He was then pointing out with statistics these gaps, especially in graduate education, between the South and the rest of the nation. In 1950 when the South had roughly 25 percent of the population we produced only 8.8 percent of the doctorates in the country. By 1966 we had increased our production of doctorates to 17 percent of the national total, yet this still represented quite a lag.

When you point out these lags in the South, it is often said either that the Negro population is one of the reasons, or that Negro higher education lacks the resources or opportunities to develop as rapidly as one might wish. But when we make allowances for Negro-white differentials in these respects, we find that there are other regional factors that explain the position of the South. Nevertheless, in 1950 only 8 percent of college-age Negroes in the South were enrolled in some kind of higher education. By 1966 the figure had gone up to 17 percent. But when we note that for the white population the figure was 46 percent, we see the great gap between Negro and white opportunities in higher education.

Today 80 percent of Negroes in the South are in traditionally Negro institutions. Ideally we might hope that we could move easily and rapidly into a completely integrated system of higher education in both the public and private institutions, but realistically it is my prediction that by 1988 almost half of the Negro college enrollees will still be in these traditionally Negro institutions. If that is anywhere near correct, then we can see the importance of contributing to the strength of Negro institutions and of enabling the Negro institutions to strengthen themselves.

In the area of adult education the seventeen southern states, with 30 percent of the national population, have only 8 percent of the adult education programs. Here again is a really stunning opportunity for development.

The Quality Gap

So much, then, for these regional comparisons of availability of higher education. I turn now to what we

usually refer to as the "quality gap" between the South and other parts of the country. Analyzing the public support given to state institutions of various kinds in the region, we find that we rank lowest among all the regions as measured either on a per-student or a per-person-of-college-age basis. When we realize that private institutions generally have about 20 percent less support per student than state institutions, we can understand the extent to which this lack of financial support in both public and private institutions leads necessarily to lower quality in higher education for our region. This is generally true in spite of certain peaks of excellence in a few very fine state universities and privately supported universities.

When we look at the averages, the region has lagged considerably in expenditures and therefore, I believe, in quality. This extends to faculty salaries at the college and university level. I will not discuss in detail the salary averages which are available, analyzed by regions, but merely report from a study by the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP recently predicted that it would take 25 years for the state universities in the South to catch up with average salaries for the country as a whole, given the existing rate of progress over the last 10 years. It would take 35 years for the public junior colleges and 70 years for the church-related colleges to catch up with the national averages.

The statistics show that the South is lowest in the percentage of its college and university faculty who hold the doctorate. In 1954-55 the figure for the South was 32 percent; by 1962-63 it was up to 43 percent. I do not have more recent data, but during that period of almost 10 years the South increased in this index less rapidly than did the country as a whole, so the gap was widening.

Allen Cartter's excellent study of graduate education analyzes the regional gap in advanced education in some detail. He points out that there is a serious lack of either strong or distinguished graduate departments in southern universities. Depending upon the discipline, he finds only 5

to 15 percent of the strong or distinguished graduate departments in southern institutions, leaving 85 to 95 percent in other parts of the country. This has meant, of course, that the most capable graduate students, especially those with fellowships that enable them to choose an institutions, have been going out of the region in rather high proportions. This regional "brain-drain," as Cartter has called it, can be of profound significance for the region.

Need for Academic Innovation

Now I move to academic innovation, which I believe will be extremely significant in all our southern colleges and universities, particularly some of the smaller institutions. Here is where operations research will be required if innovations are to be based upon facts rather than whim and fancy. Here is where we run up against the expected conservatism of college faculties and perhaps of college administrations. I have often said that a college or university is the most conservative of all institutions, even including the church. It is frequently extremely difficult to get approval of any type of change from a college faculty.

There are at least six reasons why I think we are in for a great deal of academic innovation over these next 20 years:

The increasing demands by business, industry, government and the public at large upon our colleges and universities. The critical role of higher education in societal development, economic as well as cultural, is evolving so that much more will be demanded of colleges and universities in the future. We must be prepared to deliver.

Adaptation to changes in national and world society. One example of these changes is urbanization. Our colleges just cannot remain as they are, in curriculum and many other respects, for we are in the midst of revolutionary change. The South, formerly a rural region, is urbanizing extremely rapidly and has the opportunity, I think, to avoid many of the mistakes of the large metropolitan areas by planning much more effectively for a kind of urbanization which will maintain the human dimension and the really significant

values of society. And I would like to think that the large universities will have significant impact on these changes and will react to them and help to meet problems of communities as well as individuals. I also hope that the smaller colleges will make adaptations to these societal changes.

The knowledge explosion. By this I mean the development of new knowledge, whole new disciplines, especially new interdisciplinary areas, the tremendous accumulation of knowledge and the implications this has, for example, for the library of the small college. How do we in higher education adapt to the tremendous production of new knowledge in printed form?

Changes in the student generation. This phenomenon is talked about by everyone today and understood by too few. Adolescents are the same as they used to be in many respects, but many of us connected with colleges today know that there have been rather profound changes in student attitudes and viewpoints. I, for one, think that these changes are not all bad and that colleges and universities must make proper adaptations to these changes in the student generation.

Discoveries in how people learn. Psychologists have made significant progress in this area, but we may expect much more progress in learning theory in the next 20 years. The results of this research should be plowed into our colleges through curriculum change, new teaching techniques, teaching aids and this sort of thing.

Financial necessity. As a college president, I see grave financial problems facing higher education, especially private colleges, in the very near future. These financial problems will affect the state-supported institutions as the tax dollar seeks to meet increasing needs and spiraling costs in all fields, particularly health and education. State universities may be in for increasing financial difficulties, and I know that the private institutions also face cirtical times ahead. This will force us, I hope, into changes that can result in economies while we still maintain the quality of our educational programs.

These, then, are a half dozen reasons why I believe that

academic innovation will be in order, indeed, imperative. Both the separate liberal arts college and the liberal arts college in the university environment should not retain the present curriculum structure and many of the current ways of doing things.

Academic Change

Now you may say "Well, where will academic change probably come? In what kinds of activities?" It seems to me that for too long we have assumed that because colleges were structured and operated in a certain way in the 1920's or 1930's this way is still good. If we had had institutional research programs and operations analysis in education as we have had in business and industry, we would probably know whether or not our ways of doing things have been as effective and economical as possible. Since we have not had much sophisticated institutional research, even in the large universities, many of the concepts we have held dear and thought to be inviolate in higher education should actually be looked upon as suspect until they are proven sound.

There are several concepts or methods of doing things which I think will be especially open to change. The traditional concept of credit hours and quality points is one. The accepted length of time required for graduation is another—why should it be four years, or four academic years of nine months each? Why not less—why not more? Conventional grading systems, the lecture method, ideas of what is suitable and what is not suitable for academic credit are also open to change. I can hear faculty at meetings going on and on about this matter of "Oh, we cannot give credit for this or that." And yet they have never had research to justify giving credit for things that happen in the classroom, for requiring students to listen to lectures and regurgitate what the professor has said from his dry notes of 10 years ago. Significant research has never been done to indicate whether or not something is actually worth academic credit—or, as a matter of fact, on what academic credit is.

There is some question about the desirable class size in

each area of study and each discipline. Our teachers in the Romance languages are now convinced that they cannot have more than 23 students in a class—or is it 19? I am not sure—but they know. And yet I know enough about institutional research to realize that most carefully designed studies on class size and teaching effectiveness have tended to support teaching in large classes as being as effective as teaching in small classes.

What is and is not appropriate in a liberal arts college curriculum? Again, the faculty will drone on about the liberal arts concept and its importance and why certain areas of study have no place in a liberal arts institution. Yet we nave had little research to indicate what is actually retained by the student and what its value is in relation to liberal arts objectives.

I believe that in the next 20 years we will see more developments of an interdisciplinary nature in the curriculum. The discovery of new knowledge and the development of new interdisciplinary fields will be part of the reason. The idea that the only significant heritage comes from Western civilization should certainly be suspect. The development of Far Eastern, Asian, and African studies has been coming on apace, and I think we will see more of that in the future.

Many faculty members are prejudiced against hardware as aids in learning. I do not feel that television or the teaching machine offer a panacea for making teaching more effective or an economical way for reducing the number of faculty. However, it is evident that various kinds of hardware and other products of the new technology can be helpful aids to learning and that most of us, especially in small colleges, are way behind in trying out some of these new technological developments.

Too frequently, I think, there has been an unwillingness to allow undergraduate students to engage in independent study and research. We can certainly strengthen our institutions and the effectiveness of our teaching by allowing more independent study and research by students. I hope we can

find ways of doing this so that it will not be unduly expensive, because, as I have said, we are facing financial stringency in the near future.

Commitment to one of the traditional kinds of academic calendar is a shibboleth that I hope we can throw off. We should try new kinds of academic calendars as a number of institutions have recently done, some of them in the South. By this I do not mean just shifting back and forth between the quarter and the semester system as most of our institutions have done at one time or another. There are exciting new kinds of academic calendars that are now being tried.

I would hope that we can avoid academic prejudice against the two-year community college. We learned at Florida State University some years ago that many of these community colleges offer good work and that their graduates did at least as well in their last two years as did freshmen and sophomores who had come through the Florida State program. Some of the community college transfers did better. Part of this success was due to a close working relationship between the universities and the two-year community colleges to help the latter develop proper curricula and academic strength.

We should also question the commitment to traditional principles of class schedules. Why should a class meet three times a week for 50 minutes? Why not four times or two times? Again, research, if carefully designed, can throw light on such questions.

We have generally failed to recognize the importance of off-campus volunteer experience, coordinated with learning in the classroom. We have also failed to realize that mature undergraduate students are among the best teachers of other undergraduates. In the small colleges we have not used our seniors nearly enough as teaching aides, with close supervision by the faculty, to teach freshmen and sophomores. We need curricula that will provide multi-track opportunity for students, rather than forcing all who come to us with a wide variety of abilities and interests to conform to

one track. Here again we face the problem of expense. We need research and experimentation in how we can make student residence halls something more than mere hotel accommodations.

These, then, are some of the areas that seem to me to be particularly open to academic innovation in the future. And in every one of these areas, institutional research can and should play an important part—with research to guide decision making and then to evaluate the innovation.

Institutional Management

My final area for discussion has to do with institutional management, an area in which we can and should see much change in the future. The trend toward rationalization of college management should be accelerated. Institutions are being forced into diversified statewide patterns of higher education and are growing in size. Professors are becoming more aggressive as students are demanding more participation in decision making. Automation of data processing is increasing, and the cost squeeze is becoming more acute as society makes greater demands on higher education. As these and other changes occur, the organization and management of southern colleges and universities must be altered considerably. I shall mention briefly several of the areas in college management which I hope will see changes.

First, there is the problem of trustee-faculty-student-administration relationships. I believe you have already had a session which had a bearing on certain aspects of this question. The role of trustees needs to be clearly dileneated so that they, faculty and administrators understand their proper roles and their proper relationships between each other and with state legislatures, which sometimes meddle, and religious denominations, which seem always to meddle. How can we work more effectively with trustees? This is a question I am trying to answer right now at Furman University. We are doing fairly well but not nearly as well as we should.

I am convinced that we should have much greater faculty participation in institutional management, especially in small colleges in the South. Others will say "Let sleeping dogs lie. The faculty is not pushing for an opportunity to participate. Why stir it up?" Well, I think it is coming anyway, and I happen to believe also that the faculty's participation will improve the decision-making process. The AAUP statement on faculty participation should be studied by an administrative-faculty committee in every institution. It seems that the stronger the university academically, the greater the faculty participation.

There will and should be much greater student participation in college management. An AAUP statement, widely adopted, has set guidelines and suggesions for the resolution of this area of conflict.

I believe we will continue to have some student activist groups formed on our campuses. I think, furthermore, that in five to ten years the faculties, even in some southern colleges, will form local chapters of the American Federation of Teachers, probably beginning in Florida, which is less southern than the other southern states. (Rupert B. Vance has said that Florida is southern by geographical accident only.) We will probably see Florida trying to keep up with California in this matter of teacher unionization as in most other ways.

Another area in college management that seems to require great change is business affairs. Now I am among the first to realize that a college is not a business and is not like a business in many respects, but there are many good, sound principles of business management that can be adopted and used in running colleges. I have often said that most colleges would go bankrupt in a couple of years if they had the same pressures on them as businesses do.

We can develop more economical operations, better techniques of budget-making and budget-controls. We can develop cost accounting, especially in academic areas. Not many educators know what it costs to offer a semester hour of English or music or chemistry. It is extremely revealing

when these facts are known and very helpful for the dean in dealing with some department heads who want additional faculty. It is, of course, likewise helpful to some department heads to be able to show how inexpensive their programs are.

Space use is an area of research in which most of our colleges already participate. Another is development of automatic data processing, sometimes cooperatively for a number of small colleges, no one of which can afford to have its own data processing equipment. Endowment investment is also of vital importance. Thanks to McGeorge Bundy, we now realize how conservative most college investment policies have been. These are some of the areas in business management that must change.

Finally, the problems of advance planning—long-range planning—must be resolved insofar as possible. Here, of course, institutional research is at the heart of any kind of advance planning. In this kind of undertaking, assumptions and targets need to be defined. We make various assumptions on how inflation, salary scales, faculty distribution, enrollment, educational programs and student-faculty ratio will be determined. In most of our colleges and perhaps universities, I believe, we can increase the student-faculty ratio by 15 or 20 percent over the next 20 years and not weaken our educational programs.

These, then, are some of the changes that I foresee in the next generation for southern higher education. If we are to guide these changes rather than merely be manipulated by them, if we are to make long-range rather than merely day-to-day decisions, then sophisticated operations research in the colleges will be absolutely essential.

ADDRESS

Sharvey G. Umbeck

Dr. Umbeck spoke from notes rather than a prepared paper. He discussed the university as a corporation and, in the informal discussion that followed, cited the importance of institutional research in the decision-making process during his 19 years as president of Knox College.

PANEL: Student, Faculty and Administrative Roles in Institutional Governance

THE UNIVERSITY: CORPORATION OR POLITICAL SYSTEM?

Julian Foster

The subject which we have been assigned this evening—the allocation of power in universities among the constitutent elements (faculty, students, administration, trustees)—has always been a highly controversial one, and I cannot imagine that anything I or anyone else could say would stand much chance of pleasing all in this or any other audience. I had thought of presenting my argument with objectivity and scientific detachment, and being reluctantly drawn to the conclusions which I had formulated several years previously. But I am sure you would not be deceived, so perhaps I had better come right out and state in a rather personal way my prejudices in this matter.

I first encountered the phenomenon of academic governance at UCLA when I became president of the Graduate Students Association. After serving in that office for a year, I was much persuaded of the virtues of student power (before it was fashionable to be persuaded of them). I did my best to advance the cause of student power. More recently I was chairman of the Faculty Senate at my home institution and became convinced that faculty should have the controlling voice in making institutional policy. This past year I have been on an academic administrative internship, seeing the administrative point of view, and I am beginning to realize just how much we have needed dynamic administrative leadership. I have not yet been appointed a trustee anywhere, but if this ever happens I am sure that I am flexible enough to see finally the importance of increasing the influence of trustees.

During this past year, when I have had a certain amount of time to read books and do things that faculty members seldom seem to have time to do, I have looked for some more substantial grounds for this argument. One tends, I think, to get rather accustomed to a stituation where the administration, the faculty and the students all seek greater power for themselves, in an *ad hoc* way, which stems directly from rather limited perspectives rather than from any kind of general theory. In the literature of administration, however, there are two basic schools of thought.

One school believes that leadership from the administration is the crucial determining factor in the development of higher education; that great universities are on the whole built by great presidents and are not likely to be built in any other way; and that the trustees can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of institutions. These enthusiasms for administration and trustee authority and power go together; the possibilities of opposition between the two are seldom raised. Spokesmen for this school have included Harold Stoke, Harold Dodds, Beardsley Ruml, Donald H. Morrison, Edward Litchfield and Gerald P. Burns.

On the other hand are those who see more virtue in some kind of rather important faculty participation and generally some student participation, too. They are a more mixed group. They include some "establishment" figures, such as Clark Kerr, Robert Hutchins, John D. Millett (Chancellor, Ohio Board of Regents) and Logan Wilson (President, American Council on Education). The American Association of University Professors, which might be seen more as a special pleader, is also part of this group. So are some people who have a more radical image, such as John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul Goodman and Carl Davidson of Students for a Democratic Society.

The thesis I would like to offer is that these two groups take a different view of what sort of an organization the university is. They use different models of the university. Perhaps it is not obvious why one should use a model of the university at all. It seems to me that if you were confronting

some other kind of organization and you tried to explain it to somebody by saying, "Well, it's organized as a university is," nobody would know what you were talking about. Universities are organized in all kinds of ways, and very often it seems obscure even to people who work in them just how they are organized. According to McGeorge Bundy, the presidents of Harvard have always run that university with rather firm and complete administrative control, whereas John Kenneth Galbraith says that the faculty runs Harvard with little interference by the president. Both these men, of course, have taught at Harvard, and the contrast in their views shows that you can observe an institution from the inside, yet not necessarily detect quite how it is governed. The university is a rather mysterious sort of organization, and so my theory is that people who are trying to understand the university and explain it, equate it to other kinds of organizations.

The Corporate Model

Two models offer themselves. The first is taken from the economic realm, the model of the corporation. If one says, "A university is like a corporation," some equivalencies spring to mind immediately. The corporation has a board of directors, and the university has a board of trustees; one finds the same kinds of people on these boards. A corporation has a managing director and the university has a president; in each case the chief executive has a staff working under him and answering directly to him. The faculty are equivalent to the salaried management of the corporation, the staff are its employees, while the students presumably are the customers or consumers of whatever product the corporation makes. So one can think of the university in that way, and perhaps the neatness of the analogy makes it very tempting to do so. People who defend strong administrative leadership have tended to accept that model and quite often use it explicitly.

The Political Model

The second model which seems possible is a political one. Rather than think of the university as some kind of corporation, one can think of it as a model government, as a small version of the American federal government. This is perhaps less immediately appealing because it is not an easy equivalency; one cannot see immediately something which looks like the board of trustees or like the faculty. Rather, what one sees if one looks at Washington is the Senate and the House, the Presidency and the Supreme Court—all the branches of government which seem to share power in ways that are not immediately clear and which seem to interact with each other and produce policy in this way. Perhaps the university is this kind of organization rather than the corporate organization that we are more accustomed to. This political model may look less appealing, yet I prefer it, and I would like to try to defend it mainly by looking at the consequences of taking the more obvious economic model.

First, let us consider what sort of people you get to run a business. Well, presumably experts. You do not normally think of having a democratic election of people to run a business; you choose people who have been especially trained and who have requisite skills. What kind of people then, should make university decisions?

Presumably, if the realms are alike, experts in those kinds of decision-making functions. In addition, a growing body of literature argues the applicability of management techniques to the university, such as computers to make decisions—not just to record a few grades and do accounts but to make complicated policy choices. The argument that the university is a large and complex organization (a multiversity, Clark Kerr has called it) seems to me a very persuasive one. It is indeed a very difficult thing to run, and perhaps we should have experts.

Yet there seems to be something a little unconvincing about the practice. Perhaps the strongest defender of the applicability of management techniques to the university was the late Edward Litchfield, chancellor of the University of

Pittsburgh. Many articles in magazines such as *Fortune* convey glowing admiration for this man, because he really ran a university as if it were a business. At the same time that he was chancellor, he was on the board of Smith-Corona, Avco and various other corporations. The only trouble is that Pittsburgh went bankrupt.

Others here undoubtedly have had the same sort of depressing experiences that we have encountered in California where the State Department of Finance feels able to say, based purely on financial considerations, how big certain classes should be and whether certain subjects should be taught by lectures or seminars. Business-minded bureaucrats generally have a taste for interfering, and I do not think it is just professorial defensiveness that makes me believe these interferences have been rather crass and unsatisfactory, also rather unsuccessful much of the time. Somehow these management techniques do not seem to work out as well as you might expect when they are applied in other realms. Let me suggest, then, that although the argument for the business approach in the university looks persuasive, there may be something wrong with it. Later I will discuss what I think this wrong thing is.

Fallacies in the Corporate Model

If you want to know about the organization of the university and you take the corporate model to heart, it becomes obvious that the university is a hierarchical form of organization. In a business firm the managing director plainly is on top, along with the board which chooses him and supports him; although the employees may be called on for advice, they do not give their advice by right. When the director makes a decision, he can expect to have the decision carried out. Anybody who comes to the university from the business world, bringing with him the business model, usually expects to find the same management system. Unfortunately, there seems to be a lot of evidence that the business model does not work very well. Almost every president who writes his reminiscences admits that he could not give orders the

way a managing director might and, moreover, that the faculty have certain rights. This may seem a bit odd, for middle management does not exactly have rights—not in the matter of policy making, at least. It may have rights in terms of contract and conditions of employment, but it is hard to imagine middle management citing academic freedom as a defense for refusing to carry out company policy.

So here again something seems awry in the theory of the corporation model, and I think one finds further difficulties with it when one looks at the reality. If the university is a hierarchy, why is it that many departments seem to have acquired an existence of their own and independent sources of funds, until the institution cannot affort to let certain people go because they have so much money with them? Why, if the university is hierarchical, do both faculty and students normally have quasi-independent "governments" within the larger system? If Columbia University was a hierarchy, what happened? Apparently the people at the bottom can occasionally bring down the people on top. These are not things one is accustomed to in the world of business, and yet they clearly are features of colleges and universities.

Political Realities

But the people who do view the university as a species of corporation tend to say, "Well, the practice may occasionally contain exceptions to the rule, but really and fundamentally, the university is hierarchical. Trustees do run the university. They must; they are up there on top. The president *must* be the top decision maker on the campus because of his office." This view looks at the structure and not at the reality. Political scientists used to operate this way. They would look at a legal structure and say, "The law says X has plenty of authority; therefore he must be the most powerful man in the system." That, of course, is a very poor way of looking at a political system, if one wants a reliable basis for explanation and prediction of events, for legal form does not necessarily correspond with political practice.

The political system may begin to tell one something

about the university, because the political system has no hierarchy. The President of the United States is not above Congress; the House is not above the Senate; the Supreme Court is neither above nor below the other branches. Instead there is a coequal relationship of a rather complex kind. This might be a more informative and more realistic way of looking at the university, without necessarily making value judgments about "democracy" or "student rights" or "faculty rights."

If one looks at Columbia and various other universities which have run into trouble with students lately, one detects a curious lack of realism in some of the administrative pronouncements. The administration does not seem to understand what is happening, perhaps because it is wedded to the old-fashioned model which says that it has the power and that students are there to learn. So what on earth can students be doing in the president's office?

Well, what *are* they doing in the president's office? You can justify their action or condemn it, but neither, of course, explains it. If you accept the model which says that the students are at the bottom of the system while the administration is at the top, you will probably be poorly prepared to confront what may happen next Monday morning. (It must be recognized that students, like faculty, form a pressure group with its own interests, ideas and strategy for bringing influence to bear on the system.) Generally the people who defend trustees and advocate administrative dominance, in the sense of wanting to see the influence of these groups increase rather than decrease, seem to focus on structure. They say, "The president is on top; therefore he must be the leader. The dean is the top man in his college; therefore he must be in charge of his college and of making policy for it."

Structural Approach Misleading

If we examine exactly how this works, quite often we find that the president is not necessarily the leader. There may be multiple leadership; there may even be some other individual

on campus, who is in practice more powerful than the president. Similarly, the dean is not necessarily the most powerful man in his area, even though he may have a monopoly of authority within it. The structural approach to university government will always be misleading, because it will always lead one to ask, "Who has the authority here?" And one then looks to the law or charter for an answer. A better question is "Who has the power here?" and this must be answered by careful observation of the decision-making process in operation.

Another aspect of university organization which presents some puzzling questions is conflict. Usually conflict is immediately perceived as a bad thing. Any executive who sees a feud between two major branches of his corporation sets about to stop it. In the military, certainly, feuds are deplored as organizational weaknesses. Conflict in a hierarchical organization tends to break down the lines of authority.

Are conflicts also organizational weaknesses when they occur in the university? Many people plainly think they are. But I do not know on what realistic grounds they make this assumption. There are some very quiet colleges around which are also very dull colleges. They do not progress very much, and probably there is no conflict in them. Then there are places like Berkeley, where if you say good morning to somebody he will probably give you an argument about it. Berkeley may not be everybody's ideal university, but it is a pretty good one. Somehow it seems to survive all its turbulence, and I suspect Columbia will survive its troubles in the same way. In fact, virtually every major university in this country has experienced some upheaval this year. The price of peace may be mediocrity.

If one employs the political model, he is less liable to think that conflict is a bad thing. He is more likely to find conflict natural, a source out of which progress comes. One does not really expect major political changes to take place without the shattering of consensus, but if one prefers an authoritarian to a democratic system he would deplore this

natural process. And, aside from any value judgments about rights, there are many practical reasons for doubting that an authoritarian system is an effic. nt one.

Political Goals Vague

Underlying the model of the university which likens it to a corporation, there has to be an assumption that we know what its goals are. For any corporation has certain aims. In theory, the businessman always sells at the highest possible price and produces at the lowest possible cost, paying the lowest possible wages. Reality is not quite so neat. But the corporation seems to know what it is doing, and there is a general understanding that its goal is profit maximization.

The political system, by contrast, does not have a given set of goals. Attempts to formulate the goals of the United States government drift into a jumble of rhetoric about freedom, security and prosperity. One can cite many worthy ideals, but the real problems arise because so often one ideal must be pursued at the expense of another. One can get no useful consensus about the purposes of government. This is what politics is about: disputes not only about the means to certain ends, but about what the ends are.

It seems to me that universities are much like this. There may be presidents who feel entirely confident that they have identified the goals of their institutions, but if the faculty or the students perceive the goals to be something else, I wonder if it is practical for the presidents to continue to impose their own vision? In California, for example, the state colleges have been told that they are primarily teaching institutions. The implication is that money will not be available for research, but since the colleges do want to do some research I am quite sure the system will have to change eventually to accommodate these desires. A master plan must rest on a sound basis of practical consensus, not on a shaky one of legal authority, if it is to survive. The legitimate aims of important segments of the community cannot be permanently frustrated. I do not think it is possible to define the purpose of the university, except in the most general

terms. It has all kinds of purposes, which must be balanced and compromised. The idea that this matter can be resolved simply by some kind of fiat is out of tune with reality.

But, if you do not know what the goals are, how can you choose the expert who can lead you to them? The employment of administrative experts is the central lesson of the corporate model. It has been applied to the political realm, most interestingly in Plato's argument, in which he asks: "If you wanted a doctor, you would not elect him, would you? You would choose the best qualified man. If you wanted a ship's captain, you would not select him by popular vote, you would get the man with a certificate in seamanship. If you wanted a cook, you would not choose an untrained amateur If you want a ruler, then, you require the most expert kind of expert, because this is the biggest and the most complicated job possible." Therefore, Plato proposes to hand over government to a benevolent, specially trained elite.

What is the flaw in this? If you want a doctor, you know what the goal of the doctor is: healing people. If you want a ship's captain, you know what his goals are: getting there swiftly and safely. If you want a cook, there are generally acceptable standards for evaluating the product. But if you want a ruler, you do *not* know what the aim is. If everybody knew what the point of government was, I do not know why we would have democracy. Instead we would have experts who would simply govern expertly, taking us where we wanted to go. But since we realized long ago that we do not know what the goal of government is, we have concluded that the best way is to go on electing people who may or may not have any claim to expertise, but who will represent our view of the goals among many. I suggest that the university is rather like this. I am not suggesting that we have to resort to popular election, but neither can I see how you can retain experts to show you what to do until you are sure about the end to which they should direct their efforts. The best form of governance may be the kind of balance of power which obtains in the major universities today. That the faculty and—more conspicuously—the students lack expertise is no necessary reason to deny them a major place in decision making.

The Corporate Model and Academic Freedom

What happens to the university if you take the corporate model in regard to academic freedom? This issue seems to become just another administrative problem of balancing relative gains and losses. Consider, for example, this statement by a corporate-minded college president: "Someone sooner or later invites Alger Hiss to speak at Princeton on foreign policy, or Harry Bridges to the University of California to speak on labor problems. The decision then becomes complex and sensitive. Was the invitation issued by students? If so, should they be put in their places, or should their unwisdom be tolerated? Would there be serious consequences of public criticism if the lecturer came? Will the endurance of such criticism be a smaller price to pay than the probable damage to the university?" I offer this as an example of what happens if you treat the university as a corporation. Academic freedom then becomes one means among a great many others to this great end, which you think you know, and it can be sacrificed if the cost becomes too high. On the other hand, if you think the university is a political system, then you can treat academic freedom much in the way we treat rights and freedom in the Constitution—that is, protecting them and viewing them as ends in themselves among many other ends which cannot be sacrificed to expediency.

What I have been saying, then, is that in my opinion you can understand the university more completely if you think of it as being more like the federal government than like some economic corporation. It is full of conflict and has goals which will develop variously as the university itself develops. It contains different constituents and elements, so that it may be more realistic to acknowledge its pluralistic nature rather than to seek an artificial, imposed unity. One should take account of its various elements and make policy in a political way instead of saying, "The president (or the trustees) can somehow see what is best for the organization." This, I suggest, cannot work particularly well now, and I have a feeling it is going to work a lot less well in the years just ahead.

PANEL: Student, Faculty and Administrative Roles in Institutional Governance

THE EMERGING ROLE OF STUDENTS IN ACADEMIC LIFE

William Van Alstyne

The subject I would like to consider falls into three parts. First, I would like to consider student demands to be *free from* institutional control with respect to matters of a nonacademic nature: a reduction of university authority over general political activity, freedom to go where one wishes, to enjoy an adult's right of privacy and freedom generally to cast away the burdensome overlay of institutional paternalism which has long characterized the great majority of colleges presuming to act *in loco parentis.* Second, I want to discuss student claims to *participate in* institutional decisions respecting academic life and community relations: to share in the determination of courses, to influence the selection of professors and generally to have a more substantial say in the overall management of the college. And third, I would like to look at the interface of university authority and student restlessness: the modes of procedure which a college observes in adjudicating alleged infractions of its rules, the lubricant of due process to reduce friction and to assure fairness in the administration of campus justice.

It is here, at the interface, that the law and the federal courts have recently made their most notable contributions. After a long period of neglect and indifference, the courts have gradually intervened to assure students of fairer disciplinary procedures to reduce the likelihood of summary hearings and precipitate punishment. In the course of ameliorating procedural due process on campus, moreover,

the courts have utilized certain legal principles which have also had considerable impact on the development of substantive student freedom. We may most usefully begin, therefore, with a brief review of judicial intervention on behalf of student freedoms and due process, postponing for a moment the little the law has to say respecting claims that students have the right to share in the managerial prerogatives of university government.

Until about eight years ago the test in a court of law as to whether or not the student was being fairly treated was simply whether or not the rules pursuant to which he was being disciplined had been published by the college at the time he freely matriculated there. The relationship was frankly seen as one of seller and buyer: the student knowingly bought a given academic life style by subscribing to the system of rules of the college. It seemed eminently fair, then, that he should be held to the terms of that bargain. Thus, the judicial review of his treatment by the college was a very cut-and-dried kind of inquiry. Virtually every university and every small college contained in its handbook an omnibus clause that reserved authority to require the withdrawal of a student for virtually any reason whenever his conduct became "unbecoming"—as unilaterally determined by the institution. If we were to review these conflicts merely on the basis of conformity to a rule as broadly phrased as that which typically characterized our college catalogs, the student would certainly lose—and traditionally he did.

But a growing number of courts have intervened to modify the private contract model of student relations. They have done so partly by keeping pace with changes in contract law itself, because as one looks at this situation again it quickly becomes apparent that American universities (regarded now as corporations or sellers) have traditionally been guilty of pernicious restraint-of-trade practices. The contract model assumed a freedom of consumer choice and an ability to elect among pluralistic academic life styles. It assumed on the student's part a real capacity to shop around, to find a different style of university more satisfactory to his own

preference, including some which preserved for him a certain private autonomy of his own, free of institutional discipline in the crannies of his personal conduct.

Yet as the courts began to survey the omnibus clauses in handbook after handbook, they found that virtually *all* contained the same provision. Practically all colleges reserved the authority to censor or forbid guest speakers on campus; practically all reserved the right to search student rooms; practically all policed the hours that students could be abroad or whom they could see or where they could go. If, then, we simply make a blunt comparison between the authoritarianism of the university and the liberalization of the law in the commercial field of contracts and corporate practice, to the extent that the free enterprise *model* does not apply to student rights, neither does the *law* of the free enterprise model apply.

If there were no shopping alternatives available to students, and if there was academic price-fixing because of a kind of conscious parrallelism in the provisions which institutions put into their regulations, it could come as no surprise that pretty soon the courts would apply the evolving law of new commercial contracts and strike out certain provisions as being unconscionable. Even in the crassly commercial field of ordinary installment sales where someone in a slum has to buy necessities—a sink or a washing machine—on an installment contract from a merchant whose terms are hopelessly one-sided and where the purchaser has no shopping alternatives at all, courts have refused to enforce the unconscionable clauses.

Consequently, I think it is instructive by way of review to note that omnibus clauses, which are used defensively by colleges and universities ultimately to vindicate their position when the chips are down and when the conflict is real, are now not to be relied upon.

The Acid Legal Test

The model that has begun to be accepted by the courts in the field of student freedom is, rather, a model of

government but now with a new twist. An increasing number of hitherto private colleges and universities are now securing an ever larger portion of their operating budget through governmental expenditures. This means that, like the publicly supported colleges, these institutions become subordinate to the same Bill of Rights and the same Fourteenth Amendment as the civil government itself. That is to say, the more an operator in the privacy sector derives power from governmental sources, the more that private party becomes subordinate to the First Amendment's guarantees of freedom of speech, the Fourth Amendment's freedom of privacy and the Fifth Amendment's provision respecting procedural due process. Thus in an increasing number of altercations between students and universities the acid legal test has become whether or not the institution has unduly curtailed student freedom based on the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment—in other words, whether a civil government can impose the style of regulation on the student body now imposed by the state's university, or whether the Constitution restricts the state government from so curtailing the prerogatives of these young adults.

The current now runs in the direction of holding that universities aided by government may not abridge these personal prerogatives. Thus in the last six years cases have been brought through the federal courts by students seeking reinstatement to the university after their dismissal for infraction of some disciplinary rule or another. There is a whole network of rules governing such things as random searches in student apartments, speaker bans, suffocation of perfectly orderly demonstrations on campus held to express some grievance against the institution or the larger society, right on down to the niceties of the procedural routine and the style of the hearing the university must conduct before any severe action can be taken against a student.

Students Ask Two Basic Rights

But the new dimension of student activism on campus is more in the direction of student rights to institutional

participation in two respects. One is directed to restructuring the institution itself and is accompanied by a renewed interest in its curriculum, its grading program, the means by which faculty members are initially selected, the standards by which they are promoted or dropped, granted or not granted tenure. These interests also include a concern for reviewing the research commitment of the institution—to correct alleged imbalances in the academic life style of the university caused by the heavy research demands generated by the enormous and tempting favors of government grants.

The second newly asserted right which students are seeking is the right to reverse a process which has characterized our universities since the Nineteenth Century, when institutions were established and aided by the government and given enormous land grants and money supplements, primarily to stimulate research and assistance to the local community in technology and agriculture. The communities therefore exerted a profound influence in shaping universities.

The new student restlessness is seeking to reverse that process to a certain extent; students feel that the institution should now try to have some affirmative impact on the outside community. The demands for student rights, then, go in two directions. One has to do with reforming the educational program within the institution, the other with reshaping the dynamics of academic importance in the larger community—the local, regional, national and international communities.

The kinds of stresses that result from these new demands are beyond the capacity of courts. My remarks on this subject, therefore, have to be essentially speculative. They begin simply by asking that we recognize that this demand in student activism is upon us, that we take it as a practical problem and that we look briefly at some suggestions respecting the avoidance and management of unnecessary campus disorder. We should, in this regard, hope to profit from the several reports which have come back to us from Berkeley, Columbia, Wisconsin, Howard and Duke.

On the strength of those reports, I daresay our greatest

shortcoming has been in so badly neglecting the means by which vilent confrontations might have been *avoided* and by concentrating instead primarily on the best means of restoring order to campus *once disorder has taken hold.* It might be unrealistic to assert that none of our recent campus crises need have developed if greater foresight had been used by the faculty and administration of the affected colleges. But I am confident that some could surely have been avoided and that the means are at hand to avoid them elsewhere.

Indeed, as one reviews the issues which brought on the strife in our major institutions in the last three years, in almost every case (just as in the conditions that ultimately trigger riots in our cities) there was a persistent and substantial grievance which the institution had neglected for at least two years prior to the crisis. It was certainly true at Berkeley in the restlessness of the free speech movement and the controversy over the degree to which students were free to engage in policial canvassing. It was clearly true at Columbia where complaints about the alleged conduct (which I neither credit nor discredit) of the university as a Harlem landlord were at least two and a half years old.

The same situation characterized our predicament at Duke this year when a vigil involving 2,500 students finally materialized in support of a strike by nonacademic employees for higher wages and collective bargaining. This grievance had been ventilated by the employees beginning two years earlier. The system, however, is so bulky and faculty participation is so poor and indifferent, that there had been no attempt to respond to and regularize the grievance, to bring the parties together and get the facts and then finally attempt to resolve it in a peaceful manner.

My best judgment of the situation is that these crises can be avoided, and that we need not merely talk about whether it is necessary at the second stage to bring in the police. The better part of the medicine here is preventive—by making *now* a systematic and searching review of any rumored, long-standing grievances at each institution. If that review is to be effective, however, in my judgment it should surely

include those who have themselves expressed the grievance. For if they are not included, no matter how abstractly wise the particular resolution is, its wisdom will necessarily go unappreciated by those who raised the grievance in the first place.

Revitalization of Existing Structures

Aside, then, from an urgent review in each institution to forestall immediate conflict, I think that a long-term assessment of the situation will require the revitalization of existing structures on campus. Let me speak hastily of just two of these structures—one concerning the faculty and the other concerning student government.

On almost every campus there is some kind of faculty senate or academic council, of course, but virtually every faculty member feels that his participation is at most a nuisance, generally speaking, more of a colossal headache. These bodies have failed in their tasks partly because institutional incentives are so arranged that there are no tangible rewards for first class service with regard to faculty participation in institutional policy making. The time a faculty member spends on any kind of university committee is time taken from his research, teaching and publication where nearly all tangible rewards are placed by the institution itself. It seems to me utterly unremarkable therefore that, in the main, faculty councils are indifferent bodies which are more in haste to adjourn than to confront any pressing university issue. I feel there must be some kind of internal reordering of incentives to encourage revitalization of these bodies to play significant roles.

The same thing can be said in far greater heat about student government. I should think most of us would be surprised that practically every crisis produced by students in the last five years has not come from the recognized student government. The free speech movement was way outside the established student government at Berkeley. Similarly, the breakthrough by the Columbia students was quite aside from their student government. And the student government at

Duke more or less grabbed hold of the vigil at the last minute for fear of simply being left behind. So it was at Wisconsin, too, with regard to demonstrations against recruiters from Dow Chemical Company.

To the extent that the university administration and its faculty at least need to know what is agitating the students, the best source of information should surely be the student governments. But to the extent that student governments are simultaneously kept down so that they manage only trivial responsibilities, it is perfectly clear that the more restless students will *not* be attracted to student government.

There has got to be a trade-off if the university wishes to keep informed of what is genuinely agitating the students. In order to protect the information process, in order to make sure that those to whom the administration listens within the student government are themselves in touch with the student body, in my judgment those student governments must be given substantially greater responsibility on campus.

I say this because I do not think that we can hope to have it both ways. We cannot have play parliaments; we cannot have what I would crudely call jockstrap student governments and then claim that we are surprised in an ugly fashion when an *ad hoc* student group simply forms on its own and presents in a much more dramatic fashion—a crushing fashion—a grievance that we did not suspect even existed because all our "good" students were not telling us.

Finally, as President Kirk of Columbia suggested when he was interviewed on *Face the Nation* two weeks ago, part of the way to avoid extralegal student conflict also goes back to effective deterrents that the institution must provide in a credible manner—not merely in a new assurance that the students will be heard in a regular manner, but in an effective rules system which the university administration is in a position to enforce and which, when they say they will enforce it, say so with a credibility that is currently lacking.

Most of our colleges, as I tried to indicate earlier, have such hopelessly out-of-date, ambiguous, vague, ambulatory rules that, frankly, they have very little to fall back on when

confronted with any kind of serious student crises. They have to resort to those omnibus clauses I mentioned earlier, which may not be upheld by the courts and which the faculty are loath to enforce because they seem so draconian. When President Kirk was asked what he would have done differently if he had to do it again at Columbia, he said he would have made a systematic evaluation and alteration, where needed, of virtually the entire rules structure. This would have included matters of substance, so that students would know what was strictly permitted and what was strictly forbidden. He would also have informed students about matters of procedures in trying to process the great number who were not deterred by the omnibus clause in the Columbia handbook.

Cautious Reaction to Crisis

So much for the attempt to avoid student crises. Now I would like to develop at least one other point related to the management of unavoidable conflict on campus. It seems to me that we have been able to learn at least two or three lessons from the crises that have unfolded on large American campuses in terms of their strategic management.

The first lesson is that a crisis seems to be more manageable if the initial action—or the initial *reaction*—by the institution is firm but cautious; firm in the sense of being credible but cautious in the sense of not rushing in with such a degree of force that the triviality of the original issue, pressed by a small number of students, becomes subordinated to a larger issue that will engulf a far greater body of students who become alienated by the administration's reaction.

Early in the original free speech movement at Berkeley, for instance, a hundred students were actively engaged, but the initial reaction of the university was to call the police. This step added hundreds of other students in reaction to what they perceived to be an excessive use of force. Precisely the same thing happened at Wisconsin, quite frankly, in the Dow recruiting confrontation. The police came in; they were angry and tired; they were put off by students who insisted on

being carried from the buildings; and they smashed a few over the heads with clubs. Reaction of that sort then brought down the campus.

The initial reaction, let me repeat, must be firm but very cautious so that the students who cannot be reasoned with by orderly means are not joined by many others who become involved because they are so estranged by the administration's response to the original movement. To the extent that these preferred means nonetheless fail, I see no alternative but to apply in a very systematic fashion the standard sanctions both of the academic community and the civil community. That is to say, these sanctions become warranted to the degree that one is convinced of the merits of his position and of the failure of parliamentary processes.

I do not see educational wisdom or even political value in angling for amnesties or complete forgiveness of even the most outrageous kinds of misconduct on the part of large bodies of students. For though it may win tranquillity in the short term, I think this response teaches the very unfortunate educational precept that no matter how violent a movement may be, if it is violent enough then the sheer use of force will persuade the university not to employ sanctions. If students are taught to believe that they will escape punishment by making their movement larger and more aggressive than before, then we will have unavoidably educated them into a repetition of that sort of student "participation" tactic in institutional management. Therefore, if one has been fair and cautious and regular in his first response, I warrant that a good deal of firmness ultimately becomes justified.

Let me add a word or two about the aftermath of these crises as we are now appreciating it at Berkeley, at Columbia and at Duke. Just as in the case of riots in the cities, the fact that the style of action itself has been incredibly unrestrained should not serve as an excuse for neglecting the essential merit of the issue initially pressed. The fact that students may have gotten terribly out of control ought not to mean that we can neglect what they were trying to say in the first place. The aftermath of any major campus distress surely

must have a component which will try in a more tranquil atmosphere to review carefully the original grievance to make sure that it does not lead to yet another crisis.

It would be my hope that, without trying to idealize what the university ought to be, one could at least come to terms with what has begun to develop on American campuses as a practical matter. The avoidance of genuine crises inescapably requires that there be a greater degree of direct student involvement in institutional decision making, whatever we might personally think of that involvement.

PANEL: Student, Faculty and Administrative Roles in Institutional Governance

TWO CRITICAL PARTNERSHIPS TO BUILD: FEDERAL AND STUDENT

William C. Craig

In recent years the national interest has dictated a tremendous step-up in federal assistance to education at all levels. We can safely assume that the Congress will continue these programs and that support will increase. The questions we need to answer now are: How will these programs be administered? What is happening to the relationships between the universities and the federal government? What are the effects of these new directions and forces on the academic community and the society at large, now and in the future?

In his famous Great Society speech at the University of Michigan, President Johnson said that colleges and universities must participate in the decisions or this partnership with the federal government will not work.

The form this new federalism will take vis-a-vis higher education is in the process of design. It is very important that Congress have advice and leadership from the academic world in making decisions about what to support and how much. To date, this leadership has been characterized by special interest and diffusion, reflecting a lack of clear university policy on government participation in university programs. One has the impression that too many universities and colleges backed into the decision to accept federal funds.

Historically, the federal government has supported higher education with land grants, student aid, research, facilities and equipment, in that order, with research representing far and away the largest amount. Today, the federal government is the major single benefactor of higher education, contributing about one third of its total support ($4.4 billion of a total $13.5 billion in fiscal year 1966).

The academic community has viewed this generosity with mixed emotions—some satisfaction and considerable alarm. Whether educators like it or not, they are wedded to the federal government and, as in most marriages of necessity, there are problems in the relationship that need to be, if not resolved, at least defined.

Proposals for federal support coming from the academic community are fragmented and highly individualized. President DuBridge of Cal Tech strongly endorses increased research support. Provost Truman of Columbia advocates "block grants" which cover institutional operating expenses such as the cost of heating, lights and plant maintenance. Economics professor Friedman of the University of Chicago suggests tax credits for parents of students in college, while physicist Zacharias of MIT promotes a contingency repayment loan plan for students, financed through an educational opportunity bank underwritten by the government.

For a Congress in a mood to strengthen education at all levels but accustomed to responding to an organized constituency, the "education" approach to legislation is often confusing and ineffective. The U.S. Office of Education, charged with pulling the various proposals together for the most efficacious presentation to a besieged legislature, produces results which are inevitably fragmented, a myriad of categories, complicated to administer and puzzling to the consumer. As of January 1967, the Office of Education identified a total of 76 separate programs, the basic authority for which is contained in 28 public laws.

No one denies that a revolution is going on in education. No one disputes the major role of the Congress in shaping it. The Congressional motivations, in the main, are quite clear. They are concerned primarily with economic growth and the national security. Are these motivations shared by the universities and colleges? Do legislators and academicians share the same goals? Are separate goals necessarily incompatible? Whatever the answers, one point is apparent: it is critically important in the immediate years ahead for these two bodies to understand each other better.

Need for Academic Involvement

The best illustration of the difficulty in joining the education interests with the government's legislative processes occurred in 1964-65 when Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare attempted—without success—to mobilize the education community as his main constituency in enacting the education package that became the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965. It was not until the economic argument was broached and the economists got into the process of legislative persuasion that the bill was successful.

As a result of this concern, education has become the leading growth industry in America, growing at twice the rate of the rest of the economy and creating 29 percent of the gross national product. If it is true that the Congress thinks of education in these very practical, economic terms, it appears equally true that a large segment of the intellectual community does not. Traditionally, the academic community has viewed itself as separated from the world—a place for reflection, dissent, debate and creative thought, aloof to political activity, detached from public policy. John Gardner makes the case for both scholars and activists:

> But the university must encompass both worlds. It must preserve within its walls an environment in which the relatively disengaged scholar, artist, critic, scientist or writer can live and flourish. But it must also relate itself to the organized world of action . . . through the activities of many of its faculty members, through applied research, through its professional schools and extension activities—but most of all through educating the young men and women who will some day act and lead.

The state of the union urgently requires an increasing number of educational statesmen of Gardner's stature to bridge the gap between the university and the Congress.

It is on this question of involvement versus noninvolvement that government-university relationships need careful analysis. Framing a mutually respecting relationship—not now present—is the current greatest need. Neither partner must dominate the other. Their relationship needs definition, understanding and strength. This is an area of academic governance in need of greater attention.

Causes of Student Unrest

Another dimension of the case against academic aloofness from public policy is the present ambivalence of universities towards the "outside world"—an ambivalence which accounts for one of the students' most serious hang-ups.

The statement of Oliver Wendell Holmes, that truth in a democratic society is measured by its success "in the open market place," can be applied to the apparent dichotomy between the life of the scholar and the life of the activist.

Students today are experiencing extreme disaffection, caught between the Scylla and Charybdis of the activist-intellectual dichotomy. The unique elements of American politics are participation and coalition. If James Madison is right—that coalition destroys passion and participation reinforces the existing order—then these two strong forces, absent in the student community, may be at the heart of much student unrest. It is of pertinent interest to note, also, that these elements are equally absent from the ghetto culture.

The indifference of the intellectual world is frustrating to the student. One of the most extraordinary things about President Kennedy was his ability to bridge the two worlds. His assassination brought an abrupt end to an intellectual style and a youthful idealism with which college students had deeply identified. He communicated to them a relevance. They believed that he saw their generation as the hinge of history. They felt let down when civil rights progress faltered. Their efforts, their marching, awakened the conscience of society. As the civil rights momentum slowed, they became more disenchanted.

Vietnam is another case in point. Increasing numbers of college students see it as a brutal, senseless war. Their idealism and patriotism subscribe to the view that the longer a country is at war, the more authoritarian that society becomes, and they point out that we have been at war almost constantly for the last 50 years. The draft is linked to this deep concern. Their educational goals are blocked and their social sensibilities are frustrated.

On top of these reminders of a less than ideal world, the college cannot select thousands of very bright young people, cram them into a campus (usually in multi-storied dormitories whose rooms resemble the cells of an outsized egg crate), subject these people to fierce academic and social pressures, pay scant attention to them as human beings and expect anything less than an explosion.

It is not just that students are rebelling in the impersonal university against their status as a mere number with few close emotional ties, no power, little opportunity for association with a respected adult and no chance to choose human models who have intellectual strength as well as high personal values. The frustrations of the faculty members themselves are being reflected in the students—frustrations growing out of the "publish or perish" policies of the university and the pressure to harvest government grants.

Activists Ask Relevant Education

Now let us try to understand what the student activists are saying. Their point of view needs interpretation. As to university governance, it has been said that the whole question of who should run a university depends upon your notion of what a university should be. It is this difference in definition that lies at the heart of the student power question today. The advocates of student power want the university to fulfill different functions today than it has in the past. They claim that with society changing so rapidly and drastically, the university and the idea of what education is cannot stand still and continue to be relevant to what is going on in the world.

The existence of a compact bundle of eternal verities—or what the traditionalists would call education—is perhaps the most conservative force in higher education today. How do you resolve the dilemma of meeting the academic definition of education, something that involves classical ideas of the educated man, with the task of making an education mean something to American society today? This is really the point at which the university and the student population square off, and it is one that is most difficult to resolve.

The confrontation can be modified by introducing a measure of freedom and flexibility in universities that has never been present before—by introducing a confidence in the validity of students' judgments about *what* they want to learn, from *whom* they want to learn and *how* and where the learning takes place. Administrators today are scared of students and understandably so. Is it, as a prominent administrator of Harvard put it some time ago, a conscious conspiracy on the part of students to tear down the university brick by brick?

The answer to that question today is *yes*. Students do not want the universities of yesterday, and if the Harvard administrator means "destroy" when the students mean fundamentally "change", then that is precisely what the students want today. They want to destroy the old university and put something in its place. The real question in students' minds is whether the organization of the university and the present power groups in the university are willing—indeed, are able—to accommodate sufficiently to the rapid changes that they see necessary.

Now what are the traditional reactions of university administrators to student power demands? One, the students making these demands do not represent the whole student community. They are a minority, a small, well organized, militant few whose power and influence are all out of proportion to their numbers. That argument is guaranteed to antagonize. It has been used against reform for hundreds of years, no matter what the institution, no matter what the country. You will recall the reaction at the Sorbonne last

summer when this accusation was made of a militant student group. They were accused of being a small unrepresentative group. Consequently, 25,000 students from the University of Paris marched in the streets, chanting that they were not a small minority. (It is relevant to note that few if any new buildings have been built at the University of Paris in the past 10 years, a period of sharply increasing enrollments. The largest classroom at the Sorbonne seats fewer than 200 students. Students cannot even attend the lectures.)

A second point in regard to the traditional reactions of university administrators is their view that students cannot be allowed to participate in the decision-making processes because they are transient. They come one year and go the next, say the administrators, and have no stake in the long-term welfare of the university community. It is the professors and the administrators who must live in the university; the students are only visiting. This argument is also guaranteed to antagonize.

Three, students are unreasonable, administrators declare. They do not play by the rules; they will not negotiate or modify demands; it is impossible to talk to them because they are bent on destroying the university, and they really do not care whether it changes or not. Now this is a fair criticism , but more of an *ex post facto* description. Students do not care what happens to the university, since in their judgment the university for so many years has not paid any attention to them.

Fourth, student militants, say the administrators, lack the background and credentials to determine what proper education should be. There are traditional notions of what an educated man knows, and the fact that students of today do not care about traditional notions simply shows that they do not appreciate the accumulated wisdom of Western civilization.

Universities should understand that the students of today are precisely that: they stand rooted foursquare right in the middle of today, and they care about what happens now. They are simply trying to make universities share that

concern. To students, the accumulated wisdom of Western civilization does not mean a thing to a Negro family living on foul water in the slums next door. Students are flabbergasted that the university can quietly go on teaching and worrying about credentialism when people are starving not more than a block away.

Who Should Run the University?

The question of who governs the university is at the heart of most of the nonwar student activity on campuses today, and in some cases where the university is hooked into the war in some fashion or another, the two causes merge, resulting in even more militancy. The issue, of course, began with the civil rights movement—self-determination—and its first manifestation was the free speech movement at Berkeley. Since then it has developed into sit-ins all around the country against recruiting on campus by Dow Chemical or by the military, and against building gymnasiums on park land in Harlem. The movement has been exported by the United States to European countries so that at Cambridge University, ten days ago, 200 students surrounded the century-old ceremony of investing a new chancellor, shouting "student power!" and chanting "medieval, medieval!" Similar demonstrations occurred in France, where the students took over the Sorbonne and set up student committees to administer the university.

The real core of almost all of these demonstrations, whether at Berkeley, Paris, Harvard or Cambridge is: Who is to run the university? Who is to make the decisions? Who has the power? What the students want, in the simplest possible terms, is to play a *meaningful* role in the community in which they live. *Meaningful* means more than an influential or advisory position—it means power. Students want some say in the way their lives are lived. They want to be masters of their own fate; they want to have the power to determine their own future.

This is part of their larger critique of American society, in which the power any individual has over his own life is

circumscribed by either the tyranny of convention or the coldness of impersonal institutions. The attitudes students have toward the university can be understood if looked at in terms of their criticism of American society and its institutions as a whole. All around them they see the unrepresented, the people without power whose welfare, whose futures are not in their own hands.

Therefore, when students see an institution of which they are a part controlled at the top by the rich and the conservative (their description of the trustees), the university then becomes the same inhuman force they are fighting against and they try to change it. And if the university will not change in fundamental terms very, very quickly, in their judgment it ought to be destroyed.

Narrowing down the student demands, they want to determine the rules for their own social conduct *in loco parentis*. First, they feel that not only is it not right for universities and colleges to encroach on their private behavior; such a policy, in government terms, is simply unworkable.

Secondly, they want the freedom to judge for themselves what is important in their education. If universities exist to produce responsible citizens as well as first-class scholars, it should be possible, the students say, to learn through experience and through study how to become responsible citizens. This means that students should have the freedom to build their own curriculum and to participate in social or community programs under the direction of the university for academic credit. This concept—that students should have the freedom and the power to choose their education—taxes the notion of the university as an ivory tower.

Third, as members of a university community, students feel a responsibility for the actions of the institution. For that reason students believe they should have some power over the decisions of the university that affect people outside the community. This implies that students should play a role in judging financial investments of the university (Harvard's investment in Mississippi Power and Light, for instance, has

been a source of controversy in Cambridge). It also means that students should play some role in judging the use of the university's land (Columbia, for example, destroys a park in Harlem to build a gymnasium).

This all comes out of a new definition of what the university should be doing in relation to the community. It should not, in the students' eyes, be engaged in secret research for defense establishments. It should not, in students' eyes, be involved with providing services for the mechanisms of war (particularly a war they dislike). But it should and can—without great problems, as they see it—be a center for other political and social pursuits.

Students say to me: What is so all-fired terrifying about students sitting as voting members on decision-making bodies of the university? Is it because the administrators see their vote being cancelled out by some bearded, angry student from Students for a Democratic Society? Perhaps they would not be so terrified if they thought the student who was to sit on the committee would be just like them, clean-cut, reasonable, moderate—and bored. Students do not realize how boring those committee meetings really *are*.

In summary, these two critical areas of academic governance, (1) the federal partnership and (2) the student partnership demand new statesmanship on the part of faculty and administration and should be given the highest priority.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

Kenneth M. Wilson

Dr. Wilson is vice president for research, College Research Center, Poughkeepsie, New York, a cooperative educational research agency sponsored by several liberal arts colleges for women with offices at Vassar College. He was educated at Northwestern State College of Louisiana (B.A.), George Peabody College (M.A.) and Harvard University (Ed.D.). A former instructor at East Tennessee State College and teaching fellow at Harvard, Dr. Wilson was named assistant director of the counseling service at Princeton University in 1954, becoming director the following year. From 1958 to 1965 he served as a research associate with the Southern Regional Education Board.

Gordon W. Blackwell

Dr. Blackwell is president of Furman University. He was educated at Furman (B.A.), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (M.A.) and Harvard University (Ph.D.). His career as a social scientist, educator and author includes teaching posts at Furman and UNC where he also served as director of the Institute for Research in Social Science. Later he became chancellor of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and president of Florida State University.

Sharvey G. Umbeck

Dr. Umbeck is president of Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois. Educated at Elmhurst College (B.A.) and the University of Chicago (M.A. and Ph.D.), he taught sociology at the College of William and Mary from 1938 to 1945 when he left the chairmanship of the department of sociology to become dean of the College. He accepted the presidency of Knox College in 1949. In this position he has compiled a distinguished record of service to higher education, including extensive activity in the American Council on Education.

Julian Foster

Dr. Foster, a native of England, is a member of the political science faculty, California State College at Fullerton. Having earned B.A. and M.A. degrees at Oxford University, he was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship in 1953 to study in the United States. He completed a Ph.D. in political science at the University of California at Los Angeles and was subsequently appointed to the faculty of the University at Santa Clara. He spent the 1967-68 academic year in the office of the president at Princeton University as an American Council on Education Fellow in Academic Administration.

William Van Alstyne

Mr. Van Alstyne is professor of law, Duke University. A native of California and graduate of the University of Southern California, he studied law at Stanford University and at the Hague Academy of International Law. He has taught at Yale University and in the law schools of Ohio State University, University of California at Los Angeles and Princeton University.

William G. Craig

Dr. Craig is former deputy assistant secretary for administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare as well as a former Peace Corps official. A graduate of Middlebury College, he holds the M.A. degree from the University of Minnesota and the Ed.D. degree with distinction from Harvard University. In addition to government service, his career in education and administration includes experience in public and private schools at the elementary, secondary and collegiate levels.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Voyager Inn
Durham, N. C.

June 27-30, 1968

Thursday, June 27

5:30- 6:30	Social Hour: Voyager Inn, Ambassador Club (courtesy of Educational Testing Service)
6:30	Dinner – Conference Rooms A, B, C and D
7:30	Opening Session Presiding: J. A. Davis, RELCV Workshop Orientation and Introduction of new RELCV staff members and guests Keynote Address: Dr. Kenneth Wilson Vice President, College Research Center "The Compleat Researcher"

Friday, June 28

7:45- 8:45	Breakfast (Buffet) – Ambassador Club
9:00-10:15	Presiding: J. A. Davis, RELCV Sample Study No. 1: CSQ Data on Under- and Over-Achievers—Gloria Blanton, Meredith College, and Benjamin Romine RELCV
10:15-10:30	Coffee Break
10:30-12:00	Sample Study No. 2: Relationships Between Various Kinds of Institutional Data—Wilmoth Carter, Shaw University, and John Centra, Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service

12:15	Luncheon – Ambassador Club
1:30- 3:00	Sample Study No. 3: Changes in Bridgewater College Students–Dale Ulrich, Dean, Bridgewater College, and Rod Hartnett, Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service
3:30- 5:00	Discussion of Sample Studies
5:30- 6:30	Social Hour – Ambassador Club (Courtesy of Duke University, Office of Regional Programs)
6:30	Dinner – Conference Rooms A, B, C and D

Presiding: J. A. Davis, RELCV

Issues in Higher Education: Student, Faculty and Administrative Roles in Institutional Governance

Moderator: Howard Boozer, Director, North Carolina State Board of Higher Education

Panelists:

Julian Foster, ACE Fellow in Academic Administration
Princeton University

William Van Alstyne,
Professor of Law
Duke University

William G. Craig,
Former Associate Deputy Secretary for Personnel, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Saturday, June 29

7:45- 8:45 Breakfast (Buffet) Ambassador Club

9:15	Presiding: Everett H. Hopkins President, RELCV
	Introduction of Speaker: E. Bruce Heilman, President, Meredith College
	Address: Sharvey G. Umbeck, President, Knox College
10:30-12:00	General Discussion
12:15	Luncheon – Ambassador Club
1:30- 3:00	Presiding: J. A. Davis, RELCV Comments on Researchable Problems for Member Institutions
	Consultants: Robert Glover, College Entrance Examination Board and Paul Sire, RELCV
3:15- 5:00	Individual conferences with RELCV staff and consultants
6:30	L'autobus parte per ristorante Mario's

Sunday, June 30

7:45- 8:45	Breakfast (Buffet) Ambassador Club
9:00-10:30	Presiding: J. A. Davis, RELCV Review of progress to date and priorities for the coming year
10:45-12:00	Speaker: Dr. Gordon Blackwell, President Furman University "Higher Education in the South: 1968-1988"
12:15	Luncheon – Ambassador Club
1:30	Adjournment

Appendix

RESEARCH REPORTS OF PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

The core research program advocated by RELCV was specifically designed to provide base-line data from which a wide variety of institutional problems might be explored. In terms of helping the various institutions zero in on problems of particular interest, as well as carry off these small local studies in good style, three institutions were selected for special staff assistance in conducting a "model" study on a problem of particular interest to that institution. The studies were then reported and discussed in formal sessions of this third RELCV conference, as a device for encouraging other institutions to do similar work on their own if the problems investigated seemed of wider interest.

A formal record of these reports and their findings is not provided herein; some were highly tentative, or involved sensitive issues requiring further local study.

The general nature of the studies and the principal investigators are shown below as a reminder to participants. Further information on the studies and on continuing work may be obtained from the institutional representative.

Meredith College Report

One study, conducted at Meredith College by Dr. Gloria Blanton, with Benjamin Romine as RELCV cohort, examined characteristics of students who achieved grades higher or lower than would have been expected from standard admissions indices. Significant findings could have implications for admissions policy and practice, of course, but also for examining teaching practices and grading policy.

The investigators reported comparing responses to CSQ for students achieving above expectation versus those achieving below. A number of biographical or attitudinal items were found to discriminate significantly between the two groups of students.

Shaw University Report

A second study at Shaw University, conducted by Dr. Wilmoth Carter with the help of Dr. John Cantra, attempted to view faculty attitudes and student characteristics in conjunction with one another, toward a better understanding of some of the dynamic interrelationships that may exist within the framework of the experimental program to which Shaw University has committed itself. A general finding was that students and faculty accept the relatively unique special mission of Shaw, and that the instrumentation used (CSQ and the experimental Institutional Functioning Inventory) supplement each other nicely in illuminating subtle campus forces.

Bridgewater College Report

The third model study, conducted by dean Dale Ulrich at Bridgewater College with the assistance of Dr. Rod Hartnett, asked what attitudinal changes occurred in students over the freshman year. Responses to CSQ-1, administered during orientation week, were compared to responses on CSQ-2, administered at the end of the year. Differences found were examined against the various methodological problems of attributing particular impact to particular experience.

Discussion of the studies tended to emphasize their findings, but in each case the questions of policy and program implications were also stressed. There was general agreement that not only need there be special attention to methodologically sound research, but also to placing findings in effective mainstreams for improvement in educational practices.

COLLEGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM

North Carolina

Belmont Abbey College
President: The Very Rev. Jude Cleary
EDO: Rev. Francis Foster

Central Piedmont Community College
President: Dr. Richard H. Hagemeyer
EDO: Dr. Edwin W. Campbell

East Carolina University
President: Dr. Leo Jenkins
EDO: Dr. John Davis

Fayetteville State College
President: Dr. Rudolph Jones
EDO: Mr. Charles I. Brown

Meredith College
President: Dr. E. Bruce Heilman
EDO: Dr. Gloria Blanton

Pembroke State College
President: Dr. English Jones
EDO: Mr. Terry Hutchins

Shaw University
President: Dr. James E. Cheek
EDO: Dr. Wilmoth A. Carter

Wilmington College
President: Dr. William M. Randall
EDO: Dr. Gerald Shinn

Winston-Salem State College
President: Dr. Kenneth R. Williams
EDO: Dr. W. Archie Blount

St. Augustine's College
President: Dr. Prezell R. Robinson
EDO: Dr. Frissell W. Jones

North Carolina State University
Chancellor: Dr. John Caldwell
EDO: Dr. Nash Winstead

South Carolina

Converse College
President: Dr. Robert T. Coleman, Jr.
EDO: Mr. John M. Ackerman, Jr.

Erskine College
President: Dr. Joseph Wightman
EDO: Dr. Luther M. Mundy

Morris College
President: Dr. O. R. Reuben
EDO: Mr. James L. Solomon

Voorhees College
President: Dr. John F. Potts
EDO: Mr. Thurston DeLaine, Jr.

Virginia

Bridgewater College
President: Dr. Wayne Geisert
EDO: Dr. Dale V. Ulrich

Lynchburg College
President: Dr. Carey Brewer
EDO: Mr. Jack Scott

Old Dominion College
President: Dr. Lewis W. Webb, Jr.
EDO: Dr. John R. Tabb

Virginia Military Institute
President: Major Gen. George R. E. Shell
EDO: Dr. P. Allan Carlsson

Virginia State College
President: Mr. Walker H. Quarles, Jr.
EDO: Dr. Harry Smith Blanton

EDO – Educational Development Officer